



Comprehensive Improvement Plan

2017

Estill County

Mr. Jeffery Saylor, Superintendent

253 Main St

Irvine, KY 40336

Table of Contents

Proficiency	3
Novice Reduction	8
GAP	15
College and Career Readiness.....	20
Graduation.....	25

Estill County Schools

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan 2017

For

Proficiency

Step 1: Determine the As-Is State of Your School/District Through Effective Needs Assessment Process

Data Questions: What is the Question you are trying to answer?

1. What does the data tell us?
2. What does the data not tell us?
3. What are the causes for celebration?
4. What are the causes for concern?
5. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?

Answer Questions Here:

1. The data tells us:

Proficient/Distinguished Scores

School Year/Subject	Level/Target	Actual Score
2015-16 Reading	Elementary=48.6	38.4
2015-16 Reading	Middle=53.3	43.4
2015-16 Reading	High=52.2	51.2
2015-16 Math	Elementary=45.2	39.5
2015-16 Math	Middle=49.8	40.0
2015-16 Math	High=47.0	34.5

Spring 2016 MAP PROJECTED PROFICIENCY UNIVERSAL SCREENER				
School/Subject	% Novice	% Apprentice	% Proficient	% Distinguished
West Irvine-READING	29.8	27.7	29.8	12.8
Estill County Middle School-READING	31.6	26.0	35.4	7.0
Estill Springs- READING	37.5	22.2	23.9	16.5
West Irvine- MATH	18.7	35.7	35.5	10.2
Estill County Middle School-MATH	19.3	37.5	34.2	9.0
Estill Spring- MATH	28.5	38.5	28.5	4.5

- Elementary, Middle School and High School didn't meet the delivery target in reading or math as stated in the table above.
- Elementary reading must increase 16.6% to meet their goal of 55% in 2017. Elementary math must increase 12.6% to meet their goal of 52.1% in 2017.
- Middle School reading must increase 15.7% to meet their goal of 59.1% in 2017. Middle School math must increase 16.0% to meet their goal of 56.0% in 2017.
- High School reading must increase 7.0% to meet their goal of 58.2% in 2017. High School math must increase 19.2% to meet their goal of 53.7% in 2017.
- Based on the Spring MAP Projected Proficiency data, a higher level of proficiency in reading and math is being projected than actually scored on KPREP. Elementary projected a 45.7% proficiency in reading with a score of 38.0% on K-PREP, Middle School MAP projected 42.4% of proficiency with an actual score of 43.4.
- Elementary projected 45.7% on MAP math with an actual KPREP score of 39.5%, Middle School MAP projected a 43.2% proficiency with an actual score of 40.0% on K-PREP.
- MAP Projected Proficiency data indicates incoming 3rd graders for 2016 were projected 33.0% are proficient and/or distinguished in math, reading 40.4%.

2. What does the data not tell us?

- How our demographics are changing
- Stakeholder group feels that poverty and other culture effects impact the success of students
- Amount of time for reading and math instruction built into master schedule to ensure students are receiving adequate instruction time
- Do teachers have resources and tools they need?
- How are we supporting the transitions from building to building? School to school?
- Are formative assessments given to guide instruction?

3. Celebration

- The middle school didn't meet their delivery target; however, they did increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in reading from 39.1% to 43.4% which is a 4.3% increase.
- The elementary didn't meet their delivery target; however, they did increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in math from 31.3% to 39.5% which is an 8.2%.
- The middle school didn't meet their delivery target; however, they did increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in math from 35.8% to 40.0% which is a 4.2% increase.

4. Concerns

- Teachers need additional research based training with coaching
- Improve reading and math in all areas
- Increase achievement of gap students in all subjects

5. What are the next steps for the school/district improvements? (Key Core Work Processes- Deployment of Standards (Curriculum), PLC Deployment (Protocol), Instruction (DEI)

- Continue curriculum work with revision for reading and math
- Curriculum summer work days for science and social studies
- Common assessments

Step 2: State the required KBE Goal with a long range target:

School Year/Subject	Level/Target	Actual Score	2016-17 GOAL	Must Increase	2017-18 Goal	2018-19 Goal
2015-16 Reading	Elementary=48.6	38.4	55	16.6	61.4	67.9
2015-16 Reading	Middle=53.3	43.4	59.1	15.7	65.0	70.8
2015-16 Reading	High=52.2	51.2	58.2	7.0	64.2	70.2
2015-16 Math	Elementary=45.2	39.5	52.1	12.6	58.9	65.8
2015-16 Math	Middle=49.8	40.0	56.0	16.0	62.3	68.6
2015-16 Math	High=47.0	34.5	53.7	19.2	60.3	66.9

- Increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in elementary for reading from 38.4% to 67.9%, middle school for reading from 43.4% to 70.8% and high school for reading from 51.25 to 70.2% by 2019.
- Increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in elementary for math from 39.5% to 65.8%, middle school for math from 40.0% to 68.6% and high school for math from 34.5% to 66.9% by 2019.

Step 3: State the 180 Day Objective that aligns with the above KBE Goal

- Increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in reading for elementary from 38.4% to 55.0%, middle school from 43.4% to 59.1% and high school from 51.2% to 58.2% by 2017.
- Increase percentage of students scoring proficiency in math for elementary from 39.5% to 52.1%, middle school from 40.0% to 56.0% and high school from 34.5% to 53.7% by 2017.

Step 4: Design the Strategy to reach the 180 Day Objective (this is the approach used to reach the desired state)

Proficiency 1 Strategy 2017: Develop a systematic approach to effectively design and deploy standards through the District PDSA/PLC Protocol by analyzing data from MAP, Fountas and Pinnell, SNAP, CERT and formative assessments on a bi-weekly and quarterly basis in order to monitor the rigor and congruence of assessments to standards.

Proficiency 2 Strategy 2017: Develop a systematic approach to ensure that all teachers design and deliver instruction which mirrors the direct/explicit instructional model/process (including before, during and after learning) as measured by the district Instructional Rounds process on a bi-monthly basis to monitor core instruction for reading and math.

Step 5: Create Activities that execute the strategy (this can be thought of as deployment or action steps)

Activity	Measure of Effectiveness/Expected Outcome	Person Responsible	Completion Date	Funding Source
PROF 1.1 The District Instructional Core Team will monitor reading and math curriculum documents quarterly (through One Drive) to ensure that curriculum is complete and all components are included.	-If district monitoring determines that curriculum documents are incomplete or need further revision, school leadership will be notified to include actionable items in their 30-60-90 day plans to address curriculum issues.	Lisa H. Reece (District Instructional Core Team)	December 2017, (ongoing quarterly - March 2017, End of school 2016-17, October 2017, December 2017)	Rural Funds \$7,500.00 Other \$2,500.00
PROF 1.2 -School Leadership will ensure curriculum documents are reviewed and revised monthly in school PLCs to ensure rigor of instruction and assessments are congruent to standards and all curriculum	-Each school leader will ensure that PLCs are using the District Engineer Planning Forms as part of the PLC school protocol process.	Lisa H. Reece (School Leadership/Principals)	December 2017, (ongoing monthly)	N/A

documents are complete.				
PROF 1.3 -District Leadership will provide opportunities for teachers to create science curriculum aligned to NGSS science standards for grades K-12.	-Aligned science curriculum documents K-12	Lisa H. Reece (Teresa Miller-Ruiz)	June-July 2017 Unit 1 and ongoing	Rural Funds \$7,500.00 Other \$2,500.00
PROF 2.1 -District Leadership team will conduct Instructional Rounds to monitor district problem of practice for core instruction in reading and math.	-District Leadership Team will provide feedback and next steps to school leadership minimum of 3 times per year. -District Leadership Team will discuss/identify specific strategies to address actionable items listed on next step process that will feed into individual school 30-60-90 day plans.	Lisa H. Reece (District Instructional Leadership Team)	March 2017, September 2017, November 2017	N/A

Estill County Schools

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan 2017

For

Novice Reduction

Step 1: Determine the As-Is State of Your School/District Through Effective Needs Assessment Process:

Data Questions: What is the Question you are trying to answer?

6. What does the data tell us?
7. What does the data not tell us?
8. What are the causes for celebration?
9. What are the causes for concern?
10. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?

Answer Questions Here:

1. What does the data tell us?

READING						
Schools	Baseline	% to Reduce Each Year to Meet 2020 Goal	GOAL 2016	Actual 2016	% to Reduce to Meet or Get Back on Target	Goal 2017
Elementary	31.8	3.18	28.6	36.2	10.78	25.4
Middle School	34.9	3.49	31.4	35.8	7.89	27.9
High School	38.3	3.83	34.5	38.6	7.93	30.7
MATH						
Schools	Baseline	% to Reduce to Meet 2020 Goal	GOAL 2016	Actual 2016	% to Reduce to Meet or Get Back on Target	Goal 2017
Elementary	28.2	2.82	25.38	26.5	3.94	22.56
Middle School	17.5	1.75	15.75	20.3	6.3	14.0
*High School	21.8	2.18	19.62	17.3	1.6	15.7
* New goals re-distributed for High School after achieving 2017 year target for novice reduction in 2016 school year. New reduction percentage was determined by subtracting 50% reduction 2020 goal of 10.9 from current score of 17.3, then divided over a four-year period. The new yearly novice reduction percentage is 1.6. Recalculations were then completed starting with 2017 school year.						

Data for Grades K-2
Kindergarten Sub Skills for Reading - F&P

	Letter ID	High Frequency	Int. Sounds	Blends	Segment	Rhyming	Lit. Behavior	Syllables
Exceeds	90 Students 70.9%	104 Students 81.9%	93 Students 73.2%	70 Students 55.1%	20 Students 15.7%	108 Students 85%	112 Students 88.2%	111 Students 87.4%
Meets	4 Students 3.1%							1 Student .8%
Approaches	8 Students 6.3%							
Does Not Meet	25 Students 19.7%							

Kindergarten for Math - SNAP

	Forward	Backward	Number ID	+ / -	Finger Pattern	Spatial
Exceeds	48 Students 37.8%	65 Students 51.2%	69 Students 54.3%	46 Students 36.2%	25 Students 19.7%	18 Students 14.2%
Meets	68 Students 53.6%	60 Students 47.2%	58 Students 45.7%	81 Students 63.8%	82 Students 64.6%	38 Students 29.9%
Does Not Meet	11 Students 8.7%				20 Students 15.7%	71 Students 55.9%

1st Grade Reading – F&P

Book Level	Number of Students	Percentage
Level AA	12	87 Students 56.9% Does Not Meet
Level A	19	
Level B	35	
Level C	21	
Level D	29	
Level E	2	31 Students 20.3% Meets
Level F	7	35 Students 22.9% Exceeds
Level G	3	
Level H	4	
Level I	8	
Level J	5	
Level K	1	
Level L	2	
Level M	2	
Level N	0	
Level O	2	

**66
Students
43.1%
Proficient**

Level T	1	
TOTAL STUDENTS	153	

1st Grade for Math – SNAP

	Forward	Backward	Number ID	+ / -	Finger Pattern	Spatial
Exceeds	14 Students 9.5%	12 Students 8.1%	77 Students 52%	75 Students 50.5%	58 Students 39.2%	21 Students 14.2%
Meets	51 Students 34.5%	5 Students 3.4%	20 Students 13.5%	44 Students 29.7%	40 Students 27%	23 Students 15.5%
Does Not Meet	83 Students 56.1%	131 Students 88.5%	51 Students 34.5%	29 Students 19.6%	50 Students 33.8%	104 Students 70.3%

2nd Grade for Reading – F&P

Book Level	Number of Students	Percentage
Level AA	3	62 Students 37.8% Does Not Meet
Level A	4	
Level B	6	
Level C	5	
Level D	10	
Level E	0	
Level F	8	
Level G	8	
Level H	18	
Level I	13	
Level J	9	22 Students 13.4% Meets
Level K	19	80 Students 48.8% Exceeds
Level L	10	
Level M	16	
Level N	13	
Level O	6	
Level P	3	
Level Q	5	
Level R	4	
Level S	3	
Level T	1	
TOTAL STUDENTS	164	

102
Students
62.2%
Proficient

2nd Grade for Math – SNAP

	Forward	Backward	Number ID	+ / -	Finger Pattern	Spatial
Exceeds	1 Students 0.6%	0 Students 0%	1 Students 0.6%	1 Students 0.6%	1 Students 0.6%	1 Students 0.6%
Meets	67 Students 42.7%	24 Students 15.3%	103 Students 65.6%	35 Students 22.3%	103 Students 65.6%	70 Students 44.6%
Does Not Meet	89 Students 56.7%	133 Students 84.7%	53 Students 33.6%	121 Students 77.1%	53 Students 33.6%	86 Students 54.8%

- Elementary, Middle School, and High School increased the percentage of novices' in reading. The goal for reducing novice scores by 10% were not met by any of the three schools.
- Elementary increased their novice scores 4.4% in reading.
- Middle school increased their novice scores 0.9% in reading.
- High School increased their novice scores 0.3% in reading.
- The High School did reduce novice in math from 21.8% to 17.3%. They met their novice reduction goal.
- Elementary did reduce novice scores from 28.2% in 2015 to 26.5% in 2016. The goal for reducing novice scores by 10% was not reached. They missed meeting the goal by 1.12%.
- Middle School increased the percentage of students scoring novice from 17.5% to 20.3%.
- 43.1% of students scored proficient in 1st grade and 62.2% of students scored proficient in 2nd grade based on the Fountas & Pinnel reading benchmark.
- Kindergarten is scoring below 80% on fall F&P benchmarks on letter ID, initial sounds, blends, and segmentation.
- Kindergarten scored above 80% on fall SNAP benchmark for forward counting, backward, counting, number ID, addition/subtraction, and finger patterns.
- 1st grade students scored above 80% on fall SNAP benchmark only on addition/subtraction.
- 2nd grade students did not score above 80% on fall SNAP benchmark in any area.

2. What does the data not tell us?

- Are the students that are scoring novice receiving additional instruction/intervention
- Are we enabling students to be successful with help we are offering? Curriculum? Interventions? Services?
- Are students receiving modifications and accommodations that have an IEP?
- Was attendance a factor?
- What about gender? Are there more boys or girls scoring novice?
- What the math department did at the High School to reduce the percentage of students scoring novice.

3. What are causes for celebration?

- The HS met their novice reduction goal in math for 2016 and 2017.

High School	21.8	2.18	19.62	17.3	1.6	15.7
-------------	------	------	-------	------	-----	------

- The Elementary reduced the percentage of students scoring novice from 28.2% to 26.05%, however, they did not reduce the goal of 10%. They 10% reduction goal was 25.38%. They missed their goal by 1.12%.

4. What are causes for concern?

- We didn't reach the goal of reducing novice students by 10% across the district, with the exception of math at the HS
- We are seeing an increase in novice students, especially in ELA/reading areas.

5. What are the next steps for the school/district improvement? (KCWP – Continuous Improvement)

- Look at curriculum and instruction to ensure they meet the rigor level of the standards.
- Determine if Tier I, core instruction, has 80% of students scoring at 80% or higher.
- Are differentiation strategies being used to target the different learning needs of students?
- Look at interventions provided. Are they successful? Are they meeting the needs of students?

- Are accommodations and modifications truly being implemented with students?

Step 2: State the required KBE Goal with a long range target:

Decrease the percentage of students scoring at the novice level by 50% by the year 2020.

- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in elementary for reading from 31.8% to 15.9% by 2020.
- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in middle school for reading from 34.9% to 17.45% by 2020.
- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in high school for reading from 38.3% to 19.15% by 2020.
- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in elementary for math from 28.2% to 14.1% by 2020.
- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in middle school for math from 17.5% to 8.75% by 2020.
- Decrease the percentage of students scoring novice in high school for math from 21.8% to 10.9% by 2020.

NOVICE REDUCTION GOALS						
READING GOALS						
Schools	Baseline 2015 Score	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Elementary	31.8	28.16	25.44	22.26	19.08	15.9
Middle School	34.9	31.41	27.92	24.43	20.94	17.45
High School	38.3	34.47	30.64	26.81	22.98	19.15
MATH GOALS						
Schools	Baseline 2015 Score	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020
Elementary	28.2	25.38	22.56	19.74	16.92	14.1
Middle School	17.5	15.75	14.0	12.25	10.5	8.75
High School	21.8	19.62	15.7	14.1	12.5	10.9
New goals re-distributed for High School after achieving 2017 year target for novice reduction in 2016 school year. New reduction percentage was determined by subtracting 50% reduction 2020 goal of 10.9 from current score of 17.3, then divided over a four-year period. The new yearly novice reduction percentage is 1.6. Recalculations were then completed starting with 2017 school year.						

Step 3: State the 180 Day Objective that aligns with the above KBE Goal:

- To reduce the percentage of students scoring novice in reading for
 - Elementary from 36.2% to 25.44`%
 - Middle School from 35.8% to 27.92%
 - High School from 38.6% to 30.64%
- To reduce the percentage of students scoring novice in math for
 - Elementary from 26.5% to 22.56% by 2017

- Middle School from 20.3% to 14.0% by 2017
- High School from 17.3% to 15.7 by 2017

Step 4: Design the Strategy to reach the 180 Day Objective (this is the approach used to reach the desired state):

NR 1 Strategy 2017: Improve and sustain a continuous improvement model through the District PDSA/PLC protocol, by analyzing data from MAP, F&P, SNAP, CERT, and Formative Assessments, on a bi-weekly and quarterly basis in order to monitor the students scoring novice in reading and math.

NR 2 Strategy 2017: Develop a systematic approach in order to design and deliver core instruction to ensure 80% of students are 80% successful in Tier 1 for reading and math as measured by formative assessment data bi-weekly/quarterly.

Step 5: Create Activities that execute the strategy (this can be thought of as deployment or action steps):

Activity	Measure of Effectiveness/Expected Outcome	Person Responsible	Completion Date	Funding Source
NR 1.1 The district leadership team will select and clearly communicate data points that will be analyzed and reviewed bi-weekly/quarterly to measure student achievement and will create an actionable "next steps process" for Novice Reduction in all schools.	-Leadership team will progress monitor movement toward goals through plotting formative data points bi-monthly/quarterly. -Leadership team will discuss/identify specific strategies to address actionable items listed on "next steps process" that will feed into individual schools 30-60-90 day plans.	Teresa Miller-Ruiz (District Core Team)	12-20-17 (Ongoing weekly and quarterly)	None required
NR 1.2 The District Instructional Core Team will meet weekly to monitor progress on schools and district 30-60-90 day plans, and determine needs within the district and to be addressed in District PLCs.	-The 30-60-90 day plans are regularly reviewed and modified monthly to ensure progress is being made toward Novice Reduction goals.	Teresa Miller-Ruiz (District Core Team)	12-20-17 (Ongoing weekly and quarterly)	None required

NR 2.1 The District Instruction Core Team will research and select high yield instructional strategies (1-2 each month) to be modeled and shared with the school leadership in monthly professional learning meetings, with the expectation that principals will ensure the high yield instructional strategies are implemented within each school to support reaching the Novice Reduction goal.	-The schools 30-60-90 day plans will reflect the implementation of the high yield instructional strategies and the monitoring of effectiveness through school level PLCs. -In District PLCs school leadership will share impact of high yield instructional strategies based on formative data plotted from each school.	Teresa Miller-Ruiz (District Core Team)	12-20-17	\$600 (for Core Team and School Leadership) Professional Development Funds

Estill County Schools

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan 2017

For

GAP

Step 1: Determine the As-Is State of Your School/District Through Effective Needs Assessment Process:

Data Questions: What is the Question you are trying to answer?

- 11. What does the data tell us?**
- 12. What does the data not tell us?**
- 13. What are the causes for celebration?**
- 14. What are the causes for concern?**
- 15. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?**

Answer Questions Here: 1. What does the data tell us?

KPREP 2015-2016

School Year/Subgroup	Level/Target	Actual	2016-17 Goal	Must Increase
2015-16/ Non-Duplicated	Elementary=42.3 Reading	30.2	49.5	19.3
2015-16/ Disability w/IEP	Elementary=30.3 Reading	14.8	39.0	24.2
2015-16/Free and Reduced Lunch	Elementary=42.6 Reading	29.9	49.7	19.8
2015-16/ Non-Duplicated	Elementary=38.8 Math	29.7	46.5	16.8
2015-16/ Disability w/IEP	Elementary=28.0 Math	10.2	37.0	26.8
2015-16/ Free and Reduced Lunch	Elementary=39.0 Math	29.7	46.6	16.9
2015-16/ Non-Duplicated	Middle School=47.3 Reading	35.4	53.9	18.5
2015-16/ Disability w/IEP	Middle School=29.8 Reading	19.6	38.5	18.9
2015-16/ Free and Reduced Lunch	Middle School=47.4 Reading	35.6	54.0	18.4
2015-16/ Non-Duplicated	Middle School= 44.2 Math	32.2	51.1	18.9
2015-16/ Disability w/IEP	Middle School= 26.0 Math	5.9	35.3	29.4
2015-16/ Free and Reduced Lunch	Middle School= 44.4 Math	32.2	51.4	19.2
School Year/Subgroup	Level/Target	Actual	2016-17 Goal	Must Increase
2015-16/Non-Duplicated	High School=45.5 Reading	42.5	52.3	9.8
2015-16/Disability w/IEP	*Not enough students to report (less than 10)		32.2	
2015-16/ Free and Reduced Lunch	High School= 45.8 Reading	43.3	52.6	9.3
2015-16/ Non-Duplicated	High School= 43.3 Math	27.7	50.4	22.7
2015-16/ Disability w/IEP	High School= 27.0 Math	8.3	36.2	27.9

2015-16/ Free and Reduced Lunch	High School= 43.5 Math	27.0	50.6	23.6
---------------------------------	------------------------	------	------	------

Non-Duplicated Gap Group

Reading

	Students	% Novice	% Apprentice	% Proficient	% Distinguished
Elementary	404	42.8 (26.5)	27.0 (26.6)	23.5 (32.5)	6.7 (14.4)
Middle	395	42.0 (28.4)	22.5 (27.1)	28.6 (33.5)	6.8 (10.9)
High	106	106 (47.2)	10.4 (11.2)	38.7 (35.6)	3.8 (8.6)

Math

	Students	% Novice	% Apprentice	% Proficient	% Distinguished
Elementary	404	31.2 (21.4)	39.1 (36.2)	23.5 (31.8)	6.2 (42.4)
Middle	395	25.3 (22.5)	42.5 (42.0)	26.6 (28.5)	5.6 (35.5)
High	101	20.8 (27.9)	51.5 (40.6)	26.7 (26.7)	1.0 (31.5)

- Elementary, Middle, and High Schools' non-duplicated gap group did not reach the reading or math target.
- Elementary students with disabilities must increase 24.2 points to reach the reading target of 39.0.
- Elementary free/reduced lunch students must increase 19.8 points to reach the reading target of 49.7.
- Elementary students with disabilities must increase 26.8 points to reach the math target of 37.0.
- Elementary free/reduced students must increase 16.9 points to reach the math target of 46.6
- Middle school students with disabilities must increase 18.9 to reach the reading target of 38.5.
- Middle school free/reduced students must increase 18.4 points to reach the reading target of 54.0.
- Middle school students with disabilities must increase 29.4 to reach the math target of 35.3.
- Middle school free/reduced students must increase 19.2 points to reach the math target of 51.4.
- The number of high school students with disabilities was too low to report actual scores but they did not reach the reading goal of 32.2.
- High school free/reduced students must increase 9.3 points to reach the reading target of 52.6.
- High school students with disabilities must increase 27.9 points to reach the math target of 36.2.
- High school free/reduced students must increase 23.6 point to reach the math target of 50.6.

1. The data tells us

- Students in the non-duplicated gap group did not reach the goal for reading and math
- The gap has increased for students with disabilities
- Reading in the elementary and middle is lower than math
- Reading below proficiency is not just a GAP issue but an issue for all students
- Reading and math is below what would be expected for ALL students
- HS almost met their target in reading but elementary reading dropped

2. What does the data not tell us?

- Which SED students are underperforming based on their ability levels.
- Which At-Risk students are underperforming in reading and math.
- Why 43% of high school students are novice in reading.
- Why teachers are rated as accomplished but the students are scoring in the Novice level in reading and writing.

3. What are the causes for celebration?

- Students who attended preschool reached their target on the Brigance Assessment at a higher rate.
- High school students were close to reaching the reading target.

4. Causes for concern:

- Parents do not take full advantage of preschool services.
- There is not enough instructional time to address CORE.
- Having to move through targets before students are ready then having many which require re-teaching.
- Based on novice percentages, we are seeing an increase of students performing at this level especially in reading.

5. Possible next steps: (KCWP Learning Culture and Environment)

- Focus on classroom instruction that meets the needs of all students.
- Keep students in the classroom for TIER II for more core instruction.
- Identify students who are 1-3 points away from progressing to the next performance level.
- Provide training for teachers on instructional strategies to meet all students' learning levels.
- Continue PLCs to focus on CORE instruction.
- Put systems in place to identify struggling students.

Step 2: State the required KBE Goal with a long range target:

Increase the averaged combined reading and math proficiency ratings for all students in the non-duplicated gap group.

READING						
School	Baseline	2014-2015	2015-2016	2016-2017	2017-2018	2018-2019
Elementary	27.9	31.8	30.2	49.5	56.7	64.0
Middle School	34.1	40.7	47.3	53.9	60.5	67.1
High School	31.9	38.7	45.5	52.3	59.1	66.0
MATH						
Elementary	23.5	31.2	38.8	46.5	54.1	61.8
Middle School	30.2	37.2	44.2	51.1	58.1	65.1
High School	29.1	36.2	43.3	50.4	57.5	64.6

- Increase the percentage of students in the non-duplicated gap group scoring proficient/distinguished in elementary for reading from 30.2% to 64.0%, middle school for reading from 47.3% to 67.1%, and high school for reading from 45.5% to 66.0% by 2019.
- Increase the percentage of students in the non-duplicated gap group scoring proficient/distinguished in elementary math from 38.8% to 61.8%, middle school for math from 44.2% to 65.1%, and high school for math from 43.3% to 64.6% by 2019.

Step 3: State the 180 Day Objective that aligns with the above KBE Goal:

- Increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in reading at the elementary level from 30.2% to 49.5%, middle school level from 35.4% to 53.9%, and high school from 42.5% to 53.3% by 2017.
- Increase the percentage of students scoring proficiency in math at the elementary level from 29.7% to 46.5%, middle school level from 32.2% to 51.1%, and high school from 27.7% to 50.4% by 2017.

Step 4: Design the Strategy to reach the 180 Day Objective (this is the approach used to reach the desired state):

GAP 1 Strategy 2017: Develop a systematic approach to establish a learning culture and environment by implementing evidence based practices through a PDSA model by analyzing data from PBIS, formative assessments, MAP, CERT, F&P, SNAP, Brigance, Surveys/Screeners and progress monitoring data on a monthly and/or quarterly basis to ensure appropriate support for behavioral, academic, and social-emotional needs of all students are met.

GAP 2 Strategy 2017: Develop a systematic approach to establish a learning culture and environment that ensures all students on the CUSP (those who are 1-3 points away from the next performance rating) are “named and claimed” to monitor growth toward proficiency in reading and math as measured by formative, summative, MAP, F&P, and SNAP on a bi-monthly basis in order to close the achievement gap.

Step 5: Create Activities that execute the strategy (this can be thought of as deployment or action steps):

Activity	Measure of Effectiveness/Expected Outcome	Person Responsible	Completion Date	Funding Source
GAP 1.1 -The District Track Team (DTT) will create and clearly communicate a district-wide system of interventions that includes positive behavior supports and response to intervention for reading and math based on Kentucky’s Systems of Interventions (KSI).	- School leadership will ensure the district level plan is implemented with fidelity through developing a school intervention plan which includes decisions regarding universal screening, schedules for assessments, frequent data collection and analysis, expected outcomes as a result of implementing the plan,	Margaret Snowden (District Track Team)	March 2017	No funding

	<p>and progress monitoring.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Progress monitoring data will be analyzed by each school's intervention team monthly, to determine the effectiveness of interventions, both academic and behavioral. 			
<p>GAP 1.2</p> <p>- The District Track Team will monitor the effectiveness of school's evidence based intervention practices by using a PDSA model.</p>	<p>- The DTT will review and analyze school level vital data points on a quarterly basis. To determine effectiveness of interventions, 80% of all students will be successful in Tier 1 instruction. If not, the school will provide the next steps to be addressed through each school's 30/60/90 day plans with the expected outcome to be closing the achievement gap.</p>	<p>Margaret Snowden (District Track Team)</p>	<p>February 2017, April 2017, September 2017, November 2017.</p>	<p>No funding</p>
<p>GAP 2.1</p> <p>-The District Leadership Team will monitor progress of CUSP students through the district PLC protocol and will create an actionable "next steps" process for gap closure, to be addressed in 30-60-90 day plans on a bi-monthly basis.</p>	<p>- School leadership will develop a system of "naming and claiming" to support and monitor students on the CUSP by tracking progress toward achieving the goal of proficiency through data points that will be analyzed and reviewed on a bi-monthly basis.</p>	<p>Margaret Snowden District Leadership Team</p>	<p>Dec. 2017 (Ongoing, bi-monthly beginning Feb. 2017)</p>	<p>No funding</p>

Estill County Schools

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan 2017

For

College and Career Readiness

Step 1: Determine the As-Is State of Your School/District Through Effective Needs Assessment Process:

Data Questions: What is the Question you are trying to answer?

- 16. What does the data tell us?
- 17. What does the data not tell us?
- 18. What are the causes for celebration?
- 19. What are the causes for concern?
- 20. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?

Answer Questions Here:

1. What does the data tell us?

- District is below benchmark in all areas on ACT

Subject	District	State	Deficit
English	17.5	19.0	1.5
Math	18.3	19.0	0.7
Reading	18.6	19.9	1.3
Science	18.2	19.8	1.6
Composite	18.3	19.5	1.2

The data indicates that Reading and English is of greatest concern for the school.

% Meeting Benchmark	State	District	Deficit
% Meeting English Benchmark	54.3	45.8	-8.5
% Meeting Math Benchmark	39.7	34.1	-5.6
% Meeting Reading Benchmark	49.2	40.2	-9.0

2. What does the data not tell us?

- An average of 15 inclement weather days 60 days prior to March 2016 ACT impacted learning and instruction
- Number of students who do not take ACT before the March state test
- The data does not indicate GAP, SED, socio-economic situations, FRAM information
- How students attending college compare to the student not attending college
- Kentucky only uses KYCPE benchmark to qualify students for college readiness rather than national ACT benchmarks

- KYCPE also does not place emphasis on the science section of the ACT when considering college readiness. Colleges in Kentucky and in other states use the all of the sections for national ACT benchmarks

Subject	KYCPE Benchmarks	National ACT
English	18	18
Math	19	22
Reading	20	22

3. What are causes for celebrations?

- The College and Career Readiness target in 2015-16 was 73.8 and the actual score was 76.9. The score exceeded its target by 3.1. The goal for 2016-17 is 76.7.
- The Graduation Rate target for 2015-16 was set at 95.8 and the actual score was 98.2. The score exceeded its target by 2.4. The goal for 2016-17 is 96.1.
- The 2016-17 goal for career readiness and graduation rate have been achieved
- Gear-UP grant provides a reading interventionist and student technology enhancements to assist with students meeting ACT benchmarks

4. What are causes for concern?

- Reading and English scores on ACT and CERT are below benchmarks. This data reflects the struggle across the district in reading and language arts.
- Science Scores on ACT and CERT are below benchmarks. This data reflects the struggle in reading and the lack of science instruction in earlier grades.
- The number of 11th grade students scoring below benchmark on Fall 2016 CERT. The data shows that only 25.5% of 11th grade students are meeting benchmarks on CERT. Therefore, the prediction could be made that students will continue to score below benchmarks on ACT.
- Madison County Vocational school enrollments are limited to 10 students which decrease the opportunity and access
- Only 44% of students are passing KOSSA

Fall CERT 2016

	Total Students	Above Benchmark	Below Benchmark	At Benchmark	Percent meeting Benchmark	Average Score
English 9	171	52	100	19	41.5%	14
English 10	169	75	80	14	52.7%	16
English 11	136	24	100	12	26.5%	15
English 12	155	48	90	17	41.9%	16
Math 9	179	8	169	2	5.6%	13
Math 10	168	15	151	2	10.1%	14
Math 11	144	12	126	6	12.5%	16
Math 12	155	40	94	21	39.4%	18
Reading 9	177	58	119		32.8%	15
Reading 10	168	63	90	15	46.4%	16
Reading 11	144	37	99	8	31.3%	16
Reading 12	152	18	133	1	12.5%	13

Science 9	170	15	152	3	10.6%	14
Science 10	167	31	127	9	24.0%	17
Science 11	144	21	98	15	31.9%	21
Science 12	155	14	130	11	16.1%	19
Composite 9	181	24	149	8	17.7%	14
Composite 10	169	46	112	11	33.7%	16
Composite 11	144	23	113	8	21.5%	17
Composite 12	156	23	123	10	21.2%	17

- The number of students that were enrolled in CTE courses and passed the KOSSA

Assessment	Enrolled	Completed	Taking Now	Passed
Consumer and Family Management	171	163	0	90
Environmental Science and Natural Resources	18	18	0	3
Financial Services	69	65	0	23
Horticulture	27	25	0	5

5. What are the next steps for school/district improvements? (KCWP-Learning Culture and Environment)

- A focus on ILP development to determine a student's interest for college and/or career exploration to plan multi-year course of study
- To establish a culture and environment beginning at early childhood through high school that focuses on post-secondary opportunities that include college and career readiness
- Establish communication with all stakeholders to ensure transparency on career pathways available to students
- Intentional focus on proficiency in reading and math for all students across content areas and grade levels in order to have greater success on the ACT

Step 2: State the required KBE Goal with a long range target:

CCR Goal: Our goal is to increase the percentage of students identified as college and/or career ready, from 76.9 to 100 by increasing 5.8 each year to reach a target goal of 100 by school year 2020. Target goals are not set by the state beyond 2016-17, however a growth of 5.8 each year will ensure we reach 100 by 2020.

School Year	CCR Target	CCR Actual
2015-16	73.8	76.9
2016-17	82.7	
2017-18	88.5	
2018-19	94.3	
2019-20	100	

Step 3: State the 180 Day Objective that aligns with the above KBE Goal:

The College and Career Readiness target was met in 2015-16 and exceeded the goal for 2016-17. Therefore, we will continue increasing the percentage of students that are College and Career Readiness by 5.8 percent in 2016-17 from 76.9 to 82.7.

Step 4: The Strategy to reach the 180 Day Objective (this is the approach used to reach the desired state):

CCR 1 2017: All stakeholders will collaborate to develop and create vision, mission, belief and value statements that promote a learning culture and environment which increases the percentage of students who are college and/or career ready as measured by CERT, ACT, KOSSA, WorkKeys, KYOTE, and industry certification on a quarterly/trimester/bi-annually and national test dates basis.

CCR 2 2017: The district will implement a plan that supports a learning culture and environment to ensure all students (K-12) have opportunities for career exploration and preparation for a successful pathway in life after graduation by implementing and improving the process by which students utilize the Individual Learning Plan/Unbridled Careers as measured by the ILP Completion Reports on a quarterly basis.

Step 5: Activities that execute the strategy (this can be thought of as deployment or action steps):

Activity	Measure of Effectiveness/Expected Outcome	Person Responsible	Completion Date	Funding Source
CCR. 1.1 All stakeholders will create and communicate vision/mission/belief statements to ensure the learning culture and environment in K-12 promotes college and/or career success after high school graduation.	-School leadership and SBDM Council will review and assess the current school vision, mission and beliefs to determine alignment with district vision, belief and mission statements.	Jeff Saylor Charlotte O'Bryan District Instructional Core Team	March, 2017	Other \$2,500.00
CCR 2.1 The district will implement an advising and guidance process that supports the ILP and develop a method to evaluate the effectiveness and	-School leadership and SBDM will develop a plan to support students in the process of career exploration in the elementary grades and developing the ILP in grades 6-12.	Charlotte O'Bryan District Instructional Core Team	December, 2017 (every quarter beginning in March, 2017 and end of	Unbridled Careers \$2,000.00 per year

results of the ILP process by monitoring through ILP Completion Reports.	-School leadership will monitor ILP development in grades 6-12 within the 30-60-90 day plans on a quarterly basis.		school year 2017, Oct. 2017 and Dec. 2017)	
--	--	--	--	--

Estill County Schools

Comprehensive District Improvement Plan 2017

For

Graduation

Step 1: Determine the As-Is State of Your School/District Through Effective Needs Assessment Process:

Data Questions: What is the Question you are trying to answer?

21. What does the data tell us?
22. What does the data not tell us?
23. What are the causes for celebration?
24. What are the causes for concern?
25. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?

Answer Questions Here:

1. What does the data tell us?
 - We are examining the Graduation rate for the Estill County High School.
 - Our graduation rate for last year was 98.2% which was 2.4 % above our goal of 95.8%.
 - Our state goal for this year is 96.1% which is 2.1% below our actual rate from last year.
 - Our actual rate is above the state rate of 88.6%.
 - 70.9% of “Teachers have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in this school” according to the TELL-KY Survey
 - 77.5% of “The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems” according to the TELL-KY Survey
 - Estill County is below state average regarding teacher leadership on the TELL-KY Survey

Teacher Leadership

Q6.1 Please rate how strongly you agree or disagree with the following statements about teacher leadership in your school.

a. Teachers are recognized as educational experts.	87.0%	91.5%
b. Teachers are trusted to make sound professional decisions about instruction.	87.1%	93.5%
c. Teachers are relied upon to make decisions about educational issues.	86.0%	92.8%
d. Teachers are encouraged to participate in school leadership roles.	90.9%	92.8%
e. The faculty has an effective process for making group decisions to solve problems.	77.5%	88.2%
f. In this school we take steps to solve problems.	85.0%	92.2%
g. Teachers are effective leaders in this school.	88.7%	90.2%
Q6.5 Teachers have an appropriate level of influence on decision making in this school.	70.9%	76.6%

2. What does the data not tell us?
 - The data does not tell us why we are being so successful with our graduation rate.
3. What are the causes for celebrations?
 - We have cause to celebrate because our graduation rate of 98.2% is almost 10% higher than the state average of 88.6%.

4. What are the causes for concern?

- Our current concern is why did the students who made up the 1.8% leave and not graduate.
- We are concerned that it is hard to identify the problem when we don't know the reason they left.
- Estill County is below state average regarding teacher leadership according to the TELL-KY Survey

5. What are the next steps for school/district improvements?

- Developing a plan for tracking of students' personal data and the reason for leaving school before graduating by adding exit questions to our protocol for dropping out or leaving school.
- Develop a plan to monitor the more frequent use of the Individual Learning Plan (ILP) for improving career and vocational options counseling for students and for the implementation of stronger academic components.
- Increase the capacity of teacher leaders in all schools in order for teachers to have an increased level of decision making district wide

Step 2: State the required KBE Goal with a long range target:

Increase the graduation rate. We want to implement our plan to increase our graduation rate by 0.3% to 98.5% this year with our long range goal of reaching 100% by 2020.

Step 3: State the 180 Day Objective that aligns with the above KBE Goal:

To increase the graduation rate from 98.2% to 98.5% for 2017 with the goal by 2020 of 100%

Step 4: Design the Strategy to reach the 180 Day Objective (this is the approach used to reach the desired state):

Grad Strategy 1 2017: Develop an early warning system to establish a learning culture and environment by identifying and monitoring, on a monthly basis, students who may be off-track to be promoted to the next grade level or graduate on-time according to the Persistence to Graduation Report, formative data, attendance, and behavior to ensure interventions are in place to support students graduating on time.

Grad Strategy 2 2017: Develop a process that recruits and promotes teacher leaders and creates a learning culture and environment through the National Board Certification process to build teacher leader capacity in all schools as monitored by the TELL-KY survey, teacher turn over data, and teacher effectiveness data as monitored on a bi-annually and annual basis.

Step 5: Create Activities that execute the strategy (this can be thought of as deployment or action steps):

Activity	Measure of Effectiveness/Expected Outcome	Person Responsible	Completion Date	Funding Source
Grad 1.1 District Leadership Team will review and analyze data from the Persistence to Graduation report and formative data on a semester/monthly basis through district PLC protocol to monitor interventions for those students who are off track and are at risk of failing and dropping out of school and will create actionable next steps process on the 30-60-90- day plan for students not on track for graduating.	-Schools will develop a support system to address risk factors such as behavior, attendance, academic performance and Limited English Proficiency to ensure students who are at risk (not being promoted to the next grade or not graduating on time) receive interventions -Schools will monitor the impact of interventions by the reduction of students who are at-risk on a monthly basis through PDSA model and by semester through the Persistence to Graduation report.	-Tonya Isaacs -District Leadership Team -School Leadership Team	-December 2017 -End of each month beginning in January, 2017 -Semester beginning January and September 2017	\$0
Grad 2.1 District will recruit candidates and create a teacher cohort group to provide support for teachers who are candidates for National Board Certification by providing mentors and professional learning opportunities for the completion of required components on a quarterly basis.	-At least one National Board Certified teacher in each school to build teacher leaders -Schools and district will ensure the percentage of National Board Certified teachers involved in the decision making process will increase by 2.8% from 76.6% to 79.4%(according to TELL-KY)as evidence by participation in PLCs, SBDM Teams, District Instructional Teams,	Tonya Isaacs District Leadership Team	-End of School year 2020 -TELL-KY, 2017 -October, 2017	-Funding incentives for teachers include half the cost of components totaling \$237.50 x 4=\$950.00 per teacher. -Title II

	<p>and School Leadership teams.</p> <p>-The percentage of key decision-making groups (PLCs, SBDM teams, District Instructional Teams, School Leadership Teams) will include National Board Certification Teachers.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--